

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. 2:25-cv-02363-CBM-BFM

Date May 1, 2025

Title *Kenneth Boyman v. Dolly M. Gee et al*

Present: The Honorable CONSUELO B. MARSHALL, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

V.R. VALLERY

NOT REPORTED

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

NONE PRESENT

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

NONE PRESENT

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS- ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: DISMISSAL OF ACTION

Judges enjoy judicial immunity, a “sweeping form of immunity” meant to “protect[] judicial independence by insulating judges from vexatious actions prosecuted by disgruntled litigants.” *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988). Judicial immunity applies except in actions related to (1) “actions not taken in the judge’s judicial capacity” and (2) “actions, though judicial in nature, taken in the complete absence of all jurisdiction.” *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991).

Plaintiff originally filed this action in state court, which was removed to this Court by the United States of America on March 18, 2025. (Dkt. No. 1.) The complaint names Dolly M. Gee, chief judge of the United States District Court in the Central District of California, as Defendant in this action. (Dkt. No. 1-1.) Though much of Plaintiff’s complaint is difficult to understand (and states no specific causes of action), it appears to allege that Judge Gee was biased and had a conflict of interest in a prior case of Plaintiff’s over which she presided (*Boyman v. Disney Enterprises, Inc.*, No. 2:16-cv-06543 DMG-JEM), and that by failing to recuse herself from that case, Judge Gee violated Plaintiff’s constitutional rights. (Dkt. Nos. 1, 1-1.) Therefore, it appears that Plaintiff’s claims against Judge Gee are barred by judicial immunity.

In light of the above, the Court hereby orders Plaintiff to show cause, no later than **May 14, 2025**, why this action should not be dismissed on the grounds that Defendant Judge Gee is absolutely immune from this suit. Failure to timely respond to this Order shall result in dismissal of this action with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.